



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/811,684	03/20/2001	Ron Dembo	13408.00007	1100

1059 7590 10/05/2006

BERESKIN AND PARR
40 KING STREET WEST
BOX 401
TORONTO, ON M5H 3Y2
CANADA

EXAMINER

DASS, HARISH T

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3693

DATE MAILED: 10/05/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/811,684	DEMBO ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Harish T. Dass	3693	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 June 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 and 12-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 and 12-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 6/30/2006 has been entered.

Claim 11 is canceled.

Drawings

2. New corrected drawings in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in this application because, Figures 1, 2, and 3 are prior art, see Brief Description of The Drawings, and these figures should be labeled "Prior Art".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 3693

Claims 1-10, 15-16, 18-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dembo (US 5,148,365) in view of Moore et al (herein after Moore; US 5,446,885), Tull, Jr. et al (hereinafter Tull, Jr. - US 6092056), Admitted Prior Art (APA), and "Warehouse companions take analysis well beyond relational database arena (NSTL report)", Technology in Government. Willowdale: Feb 1997.Vol.4, Iss. 2; pg. 25 (hereinafter NSTL-Report).

Re. Claims 1 15-16, 18-20, 24-29 Dembo discloses - selecting a set of financial instruments (options or securities), each financial instrument (option) in said set having a model defined therefore, each model operating on at least one risk factor to produce a value for said financial instrument (option),

selecting a set of scenarios, each scenario comprising a risk factor value for each risk factor operated on by said models of said financial instruments (options) at least a first and second time interval and each scenario having a probability value assigned thereto, said probability value representing the likelihood of said scenario occurring and - at least one risk engine (*processing software*) operable to determine an instrument risk value (risk exposure) for each financial instrument in said set of financial instruments, said risk value determined by evaluating, in view of said risk factors values in each said scenario and at each of at least a first and second time interval, a model stored for said instrument [see entire document particularly, Abs; C1 L4-L67; C2 L43 to C3 L12; C4 L50 to C5 L12; C8 L27-L67; Claims],

(15) step of modifying said set of scenarios to change at least one risk factor value and performing steps (iii) through (v) to produce a new risk metric [C1 L4-L67; C2 L43 to C3 L12; C4 L50 to C5 L12; C8 L27-L37],

(16) said at least one risk factor value is changed such that said value does not change with time [C1 L4-L67; C2 L43 to C3 L12; C4 L50 to C5 L12; C8 L27-L67], and
databases which store information for options (options are financial instruments), risk engine (*processing software*), [C1 L4-L67; C2 L43 to C3 L12; C4 L50 to C5 L12; C8 L27-L67].

Dembo, explicitly, does not disclose, - applying said selected set of scenarios to said set of financial instruments to produce at least one instrument risk value for each financial instrument in said set of financial instruments for each scenario in said set of scenarios for each time interval, and

applying said selected set of scenarios to said portfolio to produce an instrument risk value for each financial instrument in said portfolio for each scenario in said set of scenarios for each time interval;

(iv) storing first instrument risk values produced at step (iii) in a database residing on at least one computer, wherein at least a subset of said first instrument risk values comprises mark-to-future values, said database organized as a multi-dimensional structure wherein one axis of said structure represents financial instruments, another axis of said structure represents scenarios and another axis of said structure represents time intervals. wherein the at least one first instrument risk value associated with the

Art Unit: 3693

respective financial instrument. scenario, and time interval are stored in said structure, and

- for a portfolio of instruments comprising at least a subset of said set of financial instruments, producing a desired risk metric, producing a first measure of said at least one risk metric, wherein said producing step is performed by at least one aggregation engine adapted to retrieve for each financial instrument in said portfolio, stored instrument risk values for each scenario in said set of scenarios for each time interval from said database;

sum said retrieved instrument risk values at each scenario at each time interval to produce aggregated risk values for said portfolio; and compute said desired risk metric using said aggregated risk values for said portfolio.

wherein said producing step is performed after completion of steps (i) to (iv).

(18) step of storing said produced risk metrics in said database

(19) the step of determining a credit exposure risk for at least one first party who is counter party for at least one of said financial instruments in said set of financial instruments, determining a subset of said set of financial instruments for which said first party is the counter party and determining the credit exposure for said first party by retrieving said stored values and said associated probabilities from said database.

- producing a second measure of said at least one risk metric, wherein said producing step at step (vi) is performed by said at least one aggregation engine further adapted to combine associated probabilities and said additional instrument risk values for said altered financial instruments with said stored instrument risk values for unaltered

Art Unit: 3693

financial instruments in said set of financial instruments retrieved from said database to a compute said second measure of said at least one risk metric, and

- for each financial instrument in said set of financial instruments affected by said proposed transaction, altering each said affected financial instrument in accordance with said proposed transaction and applying said selected set of scenarios to each altered financial instrument to produce one or more additional instrument risk values for each altered financial instrument for each scenario in said set of scenarios for each time interval;

(25) wherein said additional instrument risk values for said altered (updated) financial instruments are stored in said database.

(26) wherein said proposed transaction comprises altering the amount of at least one financial instrument in said set of financial instruments,

(27) wherein said proposed transaction comprises adding a financial instrument to said set of financial instruments.

(28) wherein steps (v) and (vi) are performed for a second proposed transaction and said second measure of said at least one risk metric is produced for each of said proposed transactions.

However APA discloses (iv) storing first instrument risk values produced at step (iii) in a database residing on at least one computer, wherein at least a subset of said first instrument risk values comprises mark-to-future values, and wherein the at least one first instrument risk value associated with the respective financial instrument. scenario, and time interval are stored [see the immediate application's specification of

Art Unit: 3693

pages 7 line 1 to page 8 line 31, this is a prior art. Particularly, in page 8 lines 2-14] to store total risk value and probability assigned to scenario for future use.

NSTL-Report discloses database organized as a multi-dimensional structure wherein one axis of said structure represents financial instruments, another axis of said structure represents scenarios and another axis of said structure represents time intervals. in said structure” and storing the structure [see pages 1-3] to analyze a product (financial product) with more than three dimensions for different scenarios that analysis may need.

Moore discloses *applying* said selected set of scenarios to said set of financial instruments to produce a risk value for each financial instrument in said set of financial instruments for each scenario in said set of scenarios for each time interval, storing in a database each financial instrument risk value produced for each financial instrument in said set, and for a portfolio of financial instruments comprising at least a subset of said set of financial instruments, producing a desired risk metric from said associated probabilities and said determined risk values for each financial instrument of said portfolio by retrieving said stored risk values from said database, and step of storing said produced risk metrics in said database and step of determining a credit exposure risk for at least one first party who is counter party for at least one of said financial instruments in said set of financial instruments, determining a subset of said set of financial instruments for which said first party is the counter party and determining the credit exposure for said first party by retrieving said stored values and said associated probabilities from said database and risk engine (GRMS – Global Risk Management

Art Unit: 3693

system) [Abs; figures 1-7; C1 L8 to C2 L49; C3 L8-L27; C3 L48-L63; C4 L19-L36; C14 L7-L12; C30 L25 to C31 L47] to perform a risk calculation based upon a specific rule.

Tull, Jr. discloses too, storing instrument risk values produced at step (iii) in a database, a database to store each said determined instrument risk value and storing in a database each instrument risk value produced at step (ii); [(1-v)(24-iv)(20-c) for a portfolio of instruments comprising at least a subset of said set of financial instruments, producing a desired risk metric, producing a first measure of said at least one risk metric, wherein said producing step is performed by at least one aggregation engine (mathematical programming) adapted to retrieve for each financial instrument in said portfolio, stored instrument risk values for each scenario in said set of scenarios for each time interval from said database; sum said retrieved instrument risk values at each scenario at each time interval to produce aggregated risk values for said portfolio; and compute said desired risk metric using said aggregated risk values for said portfolio [Abstract; figures 1, 7; C3 L18 to C4 L63; C7 L1 to C9 L67; C13 L27 to C65; C19 L19 to C27] to periodically evaluates the performance of the financial instrument, and reflect the current aggregate value of security.

wherein said producing step is performed after completion of steps (i) to (iv) is a business choice to provide final result.

Statistics and Probability math that computing probabilities of events in finite sample is often greatly simplified by use of rules for permutations and combinations is well known of one of ordinary skill in the art of, wherein said proposed transaction comprises altering the amount of at least one financial instrument in said set of financial

Art Unit: 3693

instruments, wherein said proposed transaction comprises adding a financial instrument to said set of financial instruments, and wherein steps (v) and (vi) are performed for a second proposed transaction and said second measure of said at least one risk metric (table or spread sheet) is produced for each of said proposed transactions are business decisions and making a spread sheet (tables) with different evaluation (calculation, numbers, updates) are not an inventive idea and it is used in every business, engineering and industrial analysis to compare differences between different set of analysis with different criteria and assumption for the same problem. The examiner takes official notice that he has done many engineering analysis in area of instrumentation & control, failure mode analysis, risk assessment and procurement of equipment.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the Applicant's invention was made to modify the teaching of Dembo and include a system and applications of produce set of risk values, store the properties and attributes values and structures in multi-dimension database for different scenarios and retrieve the values/structures from database to reuse, as taught by Moore, Tull, Jr., APA and NSTL-Report, to periodically evaluates the performance of the financial instrument and analyze a product (financial product) with more than three dimensions for different scenarios that analysis may need, and perform a risk calculation based upon a specific rule, based on finite samples, and store total risk value and probability assigned to scenario for future use in multi-dimension database as a structure or an object.

Re. Claim 2, Dembo, APA, Tull or NSTL-Report does not disclose the step of defining whether each instrument risk value produced is stored in step (iv) as an individual instrument risk value or is aggregated with at least one other financial instrument value and stored as an aggregated value. However, Moore discloses defining rules, storing data separately, or aggregated [Abs; C1 L8 to C2 L50; C5 L48 to C6 L15; C17 L57-L62; C24 L37-L63; C30 L25-L67]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the Applicant's invention was made to modify the teaching of Dembo, APA, Tull and NSTL-Report and include define values as individual or aggregate, as taught by Moore, to tabulate appropriate values for situation and scenario.

Re. Claim 3, Dembo discloses where in step (v), said user first selects a subset of financial instruments of interest from said set of financial instruments and said desired risk metric is produced for said subset by retrieving determined risk values for each financial instrument in said subset from said database [Abs; C1 L6-L18; C2 L57 to C3 L55].

Re. claims 4-10 & 17, Dembo discloses (17) step of selecting a first subset of said set of financial instruments and determining a risk metric and selecting a second subset of said financial instruments wherein at least one financial instrument in said first subset is replaced with another financial instrument, and performing steps (iii) through (v)

Art Unit: 3693

produce a new risk metric [C1 L4-L67; C2 L43 to C3 L12; C4 L50 to C5 L12; C8 L27-L37]. Dembo, explicitly, does not disclose:

(4) where risk factor values for each said risk factor are also stored in said database.

(5) wherein definitions of portfolios of financial instruments stored in said database are predefined,

(6) wherein said definitions of portfolios are stored in said database, and

(7) where steps (iii), a check is first performed to determine if corresponding risk values for an instrument are already present in said database and risk values are only produced for those not already present,

(8) wherein step (iii) and (v) are performed in parallel (processing modules) on subsets of said set of financial instruments,

(9) where step (v) is performed by at least two users (workstations), each of said at least two users producing a risk metric for a different selected subset of said set of financial instruments, and (10) where step (v) is performed in parallel by each of said at least two users.

However, Moore discloses such steps [C1 L8 to C2 L50; C13 L24-L60; C17 L45 to C18 L23]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the Applicant's invention was made to modify the teaching of Dembo, APA, Tull and NSTL-Report and include storing values, definitions in database and checking if the value already exists, as taught by Moore, to save time, a common practice in business, computer and engineering such as developing tables, checking ID and password, etc. In

Art Unit: 3693

communication, control and business multiprocessing (multithreads) are commonly known and all of known operating systems support parallel processing, and it is well known that commonly used NT platform is used by many users (workstations) and users (two, three, ...) can use the same software application at the same time (e.g. WORD).

Re. Claims 21-22, Dembo discloses a risk management system according to claim 20 wherein said risk engine further comprises a user interface to allow a user to define a portfolio of financial instruments for said aggregating engine to operate on, and wherein defined portfolios are stored in said database. [C8 L12-L25; C16 L27-L37].

Re. Claim 23 Dembo, explicitly, does not disclose least two risk engines, each of said at least two risk engines operating in parallel to produce instrument risk values for a subset of said set of financial instruments. However, Moore discloses such steps [C15 L53-59]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the Applicant's invention was made to modify the teaching of Dembo, APA, Tull and NSTL-Report and include several risk engines (GRMS) operating in parallel, as taught by Moore, to add redundancy in case one system fails the user switch to next system. It is well known that most of DB systems are redundant and synchronized in recover data in case one of the database engines fails.

Art Unit: 3693

Claims 12-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dembo in view of Moore, Tull, Jr., Admitted Prior Art (APA), and NSTL-Report, as applied to claim 1 above and further in view of Ohata et al (herein Ohata; US 5,864,857).

Re. Claims 12-14 NSTL-Report discloses database organized as a multi-dimensional structure wherein one axis of said structure represents product, and

Ohata discloses wherein data is read from and written to said database in multi-dimensional groupings, wherein said grouping includes a selected amount of adjacent data from each of said axes of said structure, wherein said selected amount of adjacent data on a first axis differs from said selected amount of data on a second axis, and wherein the total size of storage required for said multi-dimensional groupings does not exceed a preselected size [Abs; C1 L5 to C4 L37; C9 L1-L67; C12 L45 to C13 L5]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the Applicant's invention was made to modify the teaching of Dembo, APA, Tull and NSTL-Report and include processing and storing multi-dimension data, as taught by Ohata, to pair the data and store them on a page for fast retrieval.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to independent pending claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Harish T. Dass whose telephone number is 571-272-6793. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 AM to 4:50 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James P. Trammell can be reached on 571-272-6712. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Harish T Dass
Examiner
Art Unit 3693



9/14/06